

The opinion in support of the decision being entered today was not written for publication and is not binding precedent of the Board.

Paper No. 41

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte YOSHITAKA MIYOSHI

Appeal No. 1998-2895
Application No. 08/430,173

ON BRIEF

Before HAIRSTON, HECKER, and GROSS, Administrative Patent Judges.

HAIRSTON, Administrative Patent Judge.

DECISION ON APPEAL

This is an appeal from the final rejection of claims 10 through 12, 19 and 23.

The disclosed invention relates to an endoscopic image display system that simultaneously displays currently obtained endoscopic moving images, previously obtained endoscopic still images, and character information related to at least one of the moving images and the still images.

Appeal No. 1998-2895
Application No. 08/430,173

Claim 23 is the only independent claim on appeal, and it reads as follows:

23. An endoscopic image display system capable of always and simultaneously displaying (1) endoscope moving images under current examination obtained by an endoscope, (2) a plurality of reduced still endoscope images from former examinations which were conducted before the current examination, (3) non-reduced still images selected from among said plurality of reduced still endoscope images, and (4) character information related to at least one of said endoscope moving images, said reduced still images, and said non-reduced still images, in a predetermined region on a single monitor, comprising:

a recording apparatus for recording image signals;

a first image memory for storing only said endoscope moving images in the form of said recorded image signals;

a second image memory for storing only said reduced and non-reduced still images in the form of said recorded image signals;

a third image memory for storing only said character information as a retrieval-character image signal; and

display control means for switching outputs of said memories of each of said images between said first, second and third image memories in every corresponding display region sequentially and for outputting the plurality of image signals to said monitor in accordance with the switching operation.

The references relied on by the examiner are:

Kantor et al. (Kantor)	4,877,016	Oct. 31, 1989
Nakamura et al. (Nakamura)	4,920,413	Apr. 24, 1990

Appeal No. 1998-2895
Application No. 08/430,173

Kikuchi
1991

5,045,935

Sep. 3,

(filed Apr. 9, 1990)

Claim 23 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being
unpatentable over Nakamura in view of Kikuchi.

Appeal No. 1998-2895
Application No. 08/430,173

Claims 10 through 12 and 19 stand rejected under 35
U.S.C.

§ 103 as being unpatentable over Nakamura in view of Kikuchi
and Kantor.

Reference is made to the brief (paper number 38) and the
answer (paper number 39) for the respective positions of the
appellant and the examiner.

OPINION

For all of the reasons expressed by the examiner (answer,
pages 3 through 6), and the additional reasons set forth
infra, we will sustain the obviousness rejection of claims 10
through 12, 19 and 23.

We agree with appellant's argument (brief, pages 9 and
10) that Nakamura does not expressly state that the character-
display-signal generating circuit 59 has a memory. On the
other hand, we agree with the examiner's reasoning (answer,
pages 5 and 6) that the character display generator 59 must
inherently "store the character signal in some form first" in
order to accurately display patient data.

With respect to appellant's argument (brief, page 10)
that the combined teachings of the references fall short of

teaching that "information from all three of these memories can be *simultaneously* retrieved and displayed," we find that the skilled artisan would have known from the teachings of the references to simultaneously view the three sources of information. As stated by the examiner (answer, page 5), "Figures 5a, 5b, 13, and 14 in Nakamura all show simultaneous display of different types of images" as claimed.

In summary, the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection of claim 23 is sustained. The 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection of claims 10 through 12 and 19 is likewise sustained because we agree with the examiner (answer, pages 4 and 6) that the skilled artisan would have known from the teachings of the applied references to simultaneously display the three different types of images on a hi-vision monitor for greater resolution of the displayed images.

DECISION

The decision of the examiner rejecting claims 10 through 12, 19 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is affirmed.

Appeal No. 1998-2895
Application No. 08/430,173

No time period for taking any subsequent action in
connection with this appeal may be extended under 37 C.F.R.
§ 1.136(a).

AFFIRMED

KENNETH W. HAIRSTON)	
Administrative Patent Judge))
)	
)	
)	BOARD OF PATENT
STUART N. HECKER)	
Administrative Patent Judge)	APPEALS AND
)	
)	INTERFERENCES
)	
ANITA PELLMAN GROSS))
Administrative Patent Judge)	

KWH:hh

Appeal No. 1998-2895
Application No. 08/430,173

ARMSTRONG, WESTERMAN, HATTORI,
McLELAND & NAUGHTON
1725 K Street, N.W.
Suite 1000
Washington, DC 20006